

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

A Supplemental IDS is enclosed to comply with the Examiner's request.

### **Drawings:**

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). More specifically, the Examiner objected to the drawings because a cylindrical structure as a ring layout of poles with or without spaces was not shown in the drawings. Applicant notes that this claim has been canceled and thus Applicant believes that this objection should be withdrawn.

### **Specification:**

In the specification, the paragraph beginning on line 5 on page 4 has been amended to correct minor editorial problems. More specifically "water does" has been changed to "water does".

In the specification, the paragraph beginning on line 28 on page 4 has been amended to correct minor editorial problems. More specifically "base don" has been changed to "based on".

### **Claim Objections:**

The Examiner objected to the claims for various reasons. One reason had to do with typographical errors. Applicant believes that all of these errors have now been corrected. The second reason the Examiner objected to the claims was due to inaccurate claim dependency.

Applicant apologizes for this error and appreciates the Examiner's willingness to consider what dependency was intended. Applicant has corrected this error with this Amendment B.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected to several claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant believes that corrections have now been made to the claims regarding all the issues under § 112 in that this basis for claim rejection has now been corrected.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected multiple claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 over various specific references. Applicant notes that all independent claims (claims 13, 32, and 34) require a "skirt having a bottom with an opening, the bottom adapted to penetrate into the seabed" or similar such words. Applicant notes that all the prior art cited by the Examiner does not disclose a skirt with an open bottom but rather shows closed "spike" type devices. Applicant's open skirt provides for greatly improved registration of signals once the sensors are being used. This is an important improvement over the prior art.

As a result, Applicant believes that all the claims include features not provided or suggested by any of the prior art of record in this case. Thus, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant now believes that this amendment complies with 37 CFR § 1.121 and thus requests examination of this Amendment. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

**BROUSE MCDOWELL**

Date	<u>Dec 22, 2005</u>	<u>Timothy D. Bennett</u>
Telephone No.:	(330) 535-5711	Timothy D. Bennett
Fax No.:	(330) 253-8601	Reg. No. 42,312
		388 S. Main Street, Suite 500
		Akron, Ohio 44311-4407